

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| In the Matter of |) | |
| |) | |
| Local Competition and |) | CC Docket No. 99-301 |
| Broadband Reporting |) | |

REPLY COMMENTS OF SPRINT CORPORATION

Sprint Corporation ("Sprint"), on behalf of its local, long distance and mobile wireless divisions, submits its Reply Comments to the comments submitted in the Second Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("Second NPRM"), released as FCC 01-19 on January 19, 2001, in the above referenced docket. In these Reply Comments, Sprint concurs with suggested improvements to the format and filing process for Form 477, recommends the continued use of zip codes rather than cities, counties or census tracts in reporting the existence of broadband services, supports the use of line counts rather than percentage of lines in setting thresholds, and agrees that ILEC service quality issues, including service quality for broadband services, should be reviewed in the docket established for this purpose.

Sprint agrees with the suggestion to streamline Form 477 and allow electronic filing rather than submission of disks.¹ Currently Sprint must maintain more than 100 separate files to make a Form 477 submission. This includes redacted and non-redacted files for each of the 17 states reported by Sprint ILECs and each of 42 states served by Sprint's non-ILEC entities. Carriers should be allowed to file a single Form 477 spreadsheet containing separate

¹ Verizon Wireless Comments at 7-8.

sections for each state in which they meet local competition and broadband reporting thresholds, rather than filing separate spreadsheets for each state. If Sprint could accumulate information in this fashion, it would reduce the number of files needed to *four*, consisting of a redacted and a non-redacted version for both the ILECs and the non-ILECs. This format would be easier to maintain and review and would effect cost savings for both the carriers and the Commission. Obviously, electronic filing is also less labor intensive and faster than loading up diskettes for delivery to the Commission.

Various commenters recommended the Commission gather actual subscribership data by city, county or census tract. This information either cannot be collected in an economically practical manner or is inferior to zip codes as data points. First, as set forth in Sprint's Comments, compiling actual subscribership information would be burdensome and likely inaccurate.² Second, Sprint does not maintain data by county or census tract and therefore cannot feasibly produce such data. Sprint could produce data by city, but it would seem that zip codes are a more reliable measure. In compiling data for Form 477, Sprint has used billing records to identify zip codes where broadband services have been sold. Since these billing records would contain the names of cities, Sprint could determine whether it has sold broadband services in a city. However, city names are often used inconsistently. The mailing address of an urban hub may be used when the true address is in a suburb. For example, the mailing address may be Dallas, Texas, when the correct city is actually the suburb of Richardson. Conversely, zip codes define a precise area and in many cases are more granular than a city. Therefore, it would seem that the zip code is a superior indicator of an area where broadband services have been sold.

² Sprint Comments at 2-3.

With respect to minimum thresholds for filing Form 477, the General Services Administration ("GSA") recommends using a percentage of the estimated total number of access lines in a state.³ Conceptually, the GSA is correct in that a percentage test would create thresholds that accounted for states with differing populations. However, such a test would be more cumbersome to implement. To arrive at a percentage requires first that the total number of lines in a state be calculated. Some third party would have to be assigned to be the keeper of the line count. There must also be a uniform method of counting lines, because broadband services can allow multiple voice channels to be derived over what was formerly one line. Further, all carriers must report line counts. Although CLECs typically don't file such information, they are included in Form 477. But then the argument becomes circular: the total line count can only be measured if everyone files, but a carrier cannot know whether it must file without knowing the total line count. In the end, the percentage-based threshold is less worthwhile than a simple line count.

Certain parties also raised the issue of collecting data to evaluate the wholesale service quality provided by ILECs with respect to broadband services.⁴ Sprint agrees that it is worthwhile for the Commission to monitor ILEC wholesale service quality in general, including service quality for broadband services. As discussed in various comments in the recent biennial service quality docket,⁵ the Commission has established a docket on wholesale service quality, CC Docket No. 98-56, and the Commission should pursue this issue in that docket. However, evaluating wholesale service quality issues is not necessary to the Commission fulfilling its requirement to determine whether broadband services are being

³ GSA Comments at 3-4.

⁴ Covad Comments at 8; King County, Washington Comments at 10-13.

⁵ In the Matter of 2000 Biennial Regulatory Review Telecommunication Service Quality Reporting Requirements, CC Docket No. 00-229.

deployed to all Americans in a reasonable and timely fashion, in accordance with Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.⁶ For this purpose, it is important whether and where broadband services exist, not who provides them.

Finally, Sprint strongly supports the comments of Verizon Wireless that the reporting requirements on mobile service providers create a burden without adding any real contribution to the Commission's goals of monitoring local competition and the deployment of broadband services. Mobile subscribership doesn't indicate any particular level of local competition and, for the reasons given by Verizon Wireless, CMRS providers should not be subject to broadband reporting requirements.

Respectfully submitted,

SPRINT CORPORATION

By //s//
Jay C. Keithley
401 9th Street, NW, #400
Washington, DC 20004
(202) 585-1920

Rick Zucker
6360 Sprint Parkway, KSOPHE0302
Overland Park, KS 66251
(913) 762-1920

⁶ 47 U.S.C. §157 nt.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Joyce Walker, hereby certify that I have on this 2nd day of April 2001, served via U.S. First Class Mail, postage prepaid, or Hand Delivery, a copy of the foregoing "Reply Comments of Sprint Corporation" In the Matter of Local Competition and Broadband Reporting, CC Docket No. 99-301, filed this date with the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, to the persons on the attached service list.

_____/s/_____
Joyce Walker

Chairman Pat Woods
Public Utility Commission of Texas
1701 N. Congress Avenue
P.O. Box 13326
Austin, TX 78711-3326

Jonathan D. Lee
Competitive Telecommunications Association
1900 M Street NW., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036-3508

Daniel L. Brenner
David Nicoll
National Cable Television Association
1724 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

John T. Scott III
Stephen J. Berman
Verizon Wireless
1300 I Street N.W., Suite 400W
Washington, DC 20005

Stephan Pastorkovich
Stuart Polikoff
21 Dupont Circle, NW Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

R. Scott Reiter
L. Marie Guillory
National Telephone Cooperative Association
4121 Wilson Boulevard, 10th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203

Thomas Jones
Christi Shewman
Wilkie Farr and Gallagher
1155 21st Street NW
Washington, DC 20036

Robert S. Tongren
David C. Bergmann
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, OH 43215-3485

Michael J. Travieso
NASUCA
8300 Colesville Road, Suite 101
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Gale Smith
Daniel Meldazis
Focal Communications Corporation
200 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1100
Chicago, IL 60615

Laurence E. Harris
Terri B. Natoli
Edward B. Krachmer
Teligent, Inc.
8065 Leesburg Pike, Suite 400
Vienna, VA 22182

Lawrence Katz
Michael Glover
Edward Shakin
Verizon Telecommunication
1320 North Court House Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201

Kathy Krause
Qwest Communications
1020 19th Street NW., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

Mark C. Rosenblum
Stephen C. Garavito
James W. Grudus
AT&T Corp
295 North Maple Avenue
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Bret Lawson
Kansas Corporation Commission
1500 SW Arrowhead Road
Topeka, KS 66604-4027

Joseph M. Sandri Jr.
Barry H. Ohlson
Winstar Communications Inc.
1615 L Street NW., Suite 1260
Washington, DC 20036

John P. Janka
Arthur S. Landerholm
Lee Ann Bambach
Latham and Watkins
1001 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Suite 1300
Washington, DC 20004

Karen M. Johnson
Richard Whitt
WorldCom
1133 19th Street NW
Washington, DC 20036

George N. Barclay
Michael J. Ettner
General Services Administration
1800 F Street NW., Room 4002
Washington, DC 20405

Jason D. Oxman
Florence Grasso
Covad Communications Company
600 14th Street, NW., Suite 750
Washington, DC 20005

Lawrence E. Sarjeant
Linda Kent
Keith Townsend
John W. Hunter
Julie E. Rones
1401 H Street NW., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005

Michael J. Shortley, III
John S. Morabito
Global Crossing
180 South Clinton Ave
Rochester, NY 14646

Marlin Blizinsky
King County, Washington
700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2300
Seattle, WA 98104

Thomas K. Crowe
Tania J. Cho
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
2300 M Street NW., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20037

Joel Ader
Telecordia Technologies
710 L'Enfant Plaza S.W.,
Promenade Level, East Building
Washington, D.C. 20024